arXiv:hep-th/9403056v1 9 Mar 1994

Nonrelativistic Chern-Simons theory for the Repulsive Bose Gas*

Igor V. Barashenkov †
Department of Applied Mathematics, University of Cape Town,
Private Bag Rondebosch 7700, South Africa

Alexander O. Harin ‡
Department of Mathematics and Applied Mathematics,
University of Natal, Durban 4001, South Africa

We propose a new nonrelativistic Chern-Simons theory based on a simple modification of the standard Lagrangian. This admits asymptotically nonvanishing field configurations and is applicable to the description of systems of repulsive bosons. The new model supports topological vortices and has a self-dual limit, both in the pure Chern-Simons and in the mixed Chern-Simons-Maxwell cases. The analysis is based on a new formulation of the Chern-Simons theories as constrained Hamiltonian systems.

PACS numbers: 03.65.Ge, 11.10.Lm, 11.15.-q, 74.20.Kk, 03.50.Kk

Chern-Simons vortices are currently considered as a candidate for anyon-like objects in quasiplanar systems of condensed matter physics. Both relativistic and nonrelativistic matter fields can support these structures [1]. So far the relativistic model seems to have exhibited a wider spectrum of solutions. It was shown to possess both topological vortices, i.e. asymptotically nonvanishing solutions with quantized flux [2,3] and nontopological solitons [4] for which the matter field ψ vanishes at infinity. On the contrary, the *nonrelativistic* model, which may happen to be more relevant for actual applications, exhibits only asymptotically vanishing solitons, or "lumps" [5]. These structures arise when the interaction between the bosons is attractive, $U \sim -(\psi\psi^*)^2$. Since the lumps have nonzero vorticity and even some topological characteristics (the flux is quantized), they are sometimes referred to as vortices and topological solitons. However, these are clearly distinct from what are usually called topological solitons on the plane, i.e. asymptotically nonvanishing solutions approaching different vacua in different directions. The "genuine" topological vortices, or "topological defects" interpolating between different nonzero vacua, turned out to be absent in the nonrelativistic Chern-Simons theory, though one could have expected them to arise in the case of *repulsive* nonlinearities $U(\psi)$. Furthermore, it can be readily shown [6] that the nonzero vacuum solution itself is not admitted by the "standard" nonrelativistic model. There is no "condensate" in this theory, and it cannot be used to describe repulsive boson gases.

The main objective of the present work is to incorporate the condensate into the nonrelativistic gauge theory. We show that the inapplicability of the standard model for the description of asymptotically nonvanishing fields can be traced back to an inadequate Lagrangian formulation of its nongauged precursor. Appropriately modifying this Lagrangian and using it as a basis for the gauge theory, we arrive at a new version of the gauged nonlinear Schrödinger equation which is completely compatible with the nonvanishing ("condensate") boundary conditions.

We start with the one-dimensional nonlinear Schrödinger equation with a general nonlinearity,

$$i\psi_t + \psi_{xx} + F(\rho)\psi = 0. \tag{1}$$

Here $\rho = |\psi|^2$, and $F(\rho) = -dU/d\rho$. The standard Lagrangian for eq. (1),

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{i}{2}(\psi_t\psi^* - \psi_t^*\psi) - |\psi_x|^2 - U(\rho), \tag{2}$$

does not *automatically* produce correct integrals of motion for solutions with $|\psi|^2$ approaching ρ_0 at infinity. First of all, the integral for the number of particles,

$$N = \int \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \psi_t} i\psi - \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \psi_t^*} i\psi^* \right) dx, \tag{3}$$

takes the form $N = \int \rho \, dx$ and apparently diverges. The regularized number of particles,

$$N = \int (\rho - \rho_0)\, dx, \tag{4}$$

is obtained by the *ad hoc* subtraction of the background contribution.

The standard definition of momentum,

$$P = \int \left(\psi_x \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \psi_t} + \psi_x^* \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \psi_t^*} \right) dx, \tag{5}$$

does not yield the correct expression either. For the Lagrangian (2) one obtains $P = (i/2)\int (\psi_x\psi^* - \psi_x^*\psi)\, dx$

---

[*] To appear in *Physical Review Letters*

[†] *E-mail*: igor@uctvax.uct.ac.za; igor@maths.uct.ac.za

[‡] *E-mail*: harin@ph.und.ac.za; harin@lourie.und.ac.za

which is not compatible with the Hamiltonian structure of the model [7]. Indeed, varying this P gives

$$\delta P = i\int (\psi_x\delta\psi^* - \psi_x^*\delta\psi)dx - \rho_0\delta\mathrm{Arg}\,\psi\big|_{-\infty}^{+\infty}.$$

Due to the appearance of the boundary term we cannot compute the functional derivatives $\delta P/\delta\psi$ and $\delta P/\delta\psi^*$. As a result, the Poisson bracket of P with some other functional (e.g. the Hamiltonian) can not be evaluated. To obtain the definition compatible with the Hamiltonian structure we again have to make an *a posteriori* regularization [7] (see also [8]):

$$\begin{aligned} P &= \frac{i}{2}\int \left(\psi^*\psi_x - \psi\psi_x^*\right) dx + \rho_0\mathrm{Arg}\,\psi\big|_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \\ &= \frac{i}{2}\int \left(\psi^*\psi_x - \psi\psi_x^*\right)\left(1 - \frac{\rho_0}{\rho}\right) dx. \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

Proceeding to two dimensions, the standard definition $\mathbf{P} = (i/2)\int(\psi^*\boldsymbol{\nabla}\psi - \psi\boldsymbol{\nabla}\psi^*)\,d^2r$ is even less suitable, since for asymptotically nonvanishing configurations this integral, in general, diverges.

Now we turn to the gauged nonlinear Schrödinger equation as formulated by Jackiw and Pi [5]:

$$i\psi_t - eA_0\psi + \mathbf{D}^2\psi + F(\rho)\psi = 0. \tag{7a}$$

Here $D_\alpha = \partial_\alpha + ieA_\alpha$ and the Abelian gauge field A_α satisfies

$$\mu\partial_\beta F^{\beta\alpha} + \frac{\kappa}{2}\epsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma}F_{\beta\gamma} = eJ^\alpha. \tag{7b}$$

Eq. (7b) is the most general linear gauge-field equation. It combines both the Maxwell and Chern-Simons interactions. $J^\alpha = (J_0, \mathbf{J})$ denotes the conserved matter current:

$$J_0 = \rho = |\psi|^2, \tag{8a}$$

$$\mathbf{J} = \frac{1}{i}\{\psi^*(\mathbf{D}\psi) - \psi(\mathbf{D}\psi)^*\}. \tag{8b}$$

$F_{\alpha\beta} = \partial_\alpha A_\beta - \partial_\alpha A_\beta$ and Greek and Latin indices run over 0,1,2 and 1,2, respectively. The parameters μ and κ control the relative contributions of the Maxwell and Chern-Simons terms in the corresponding Lagrangian:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} = &\frac{i}{2}\left\{\psi^*(D_0\psi) - \psi(D_0\psi)^*\right\} - (D_k\psi)^*(D_k\psi) \\ &-\frac{\mu}{4}F_{\alpha\beta}F^{\alpha\beta} + \frac{\kappa}{4}\epsilon^{\gamma\alpha\beta}A_\gamma F_{\alpha\beta} - U(\rho). \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

μ is ≥ 0; we also assume $\kappa \geq 0$. The case of negative κ is recovered by the parity transformation ($x^1 \rightleftharpoons x^2$, $A^1 \rightleftharpoons A^2$).

This system inherits the drawback of its nongauged counterpart. The momentum, defined by

$$P_i = \int \left[\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial x^i}\frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial\psi_t} + \frac{\partial\psi^*}{\partial x^i}\frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial\psi_t^*} + \frac{\partial A^\alpha}{\partial x^i}\frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial A_t^\alpha}\right] d^2x, \tag{10}$$

equals

$$\begin{aligned} P_i &= \int\left[\frac{i}{2}\left\{\psi^*(D_i\psi) - \psi(D_i\psi)^*\right\} - \mu\epsilon_{ij}E^jB\right]d^2x \\ &= \int \rho\left(eA^i - \partial_i\mathrm{Arg}\,\psi\right)d^2x - \mu\int\epsilon_{ij}E^jB\,d^2x. \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

Here $E^i = F^{i0}$ and $B = F^{21}$ are electric and magnetic fields, respectively. The momentum in this case is finite provided $A^i \to (1/e)\partial_i\mathrm{Arg}\,\psi$ at infinity, but the functional derivatives $\delta P_i/\delta\psi$ and $\delta P_i/\delta\psi^*$ still cannot be calculated.

Returning to the one-dimensional nongauged NLS (1), a natural question is: Is it possible to find a Lagrangian producing the same Euler-Lagrange equations as eq. (2) but at the same time *automatically* yielding the correct integrals of motion? The answer is yes. The Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{i}{2}(\psi_t\psi^* - \psi_t^*\psi)\left(1 - \frac{\rho_0}{\rho}\right) - |\psi_x|^2 - U(\rho), \tag{12}$$

produces the same NLS (1), while formulas (3) and (5) yield the regularized integrals N and P, as given exactly by (4) and (6).

One may argue that the modification is in a sense trivial, since eqs. (12) and (2) differ only by a total derivative. However, this is no longer the case if the gauge field is added:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} = &\frac{i}{2}\left\{\psi^*(D_0\psi) - \psi(D_0\psi)^*\right\}\left(1 - \frac{\rho_0}{\rho}\right) - (D_k\psi)^*(D_k\psi) \\ &-\frac{\mu}{4}F_{\alpha\beta}F^{\alpha\beta} + \frac{\kappa}{4}\epsilon^{\gamma\alpha\beta}A_\gamma F_{\alpha\beta} - U(\rho). \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

This is a *new* system. The field equations resulting from (13) differ from those of the standard model (9). The difference lies in the definition of the number density:

$$J_0 = \rho - \rho_0. \tag{14}$$

Apart from that, the field equations are the same, eqs. (7), with the spatial part of the current being given by the standard expression (8b). However, the new system does possess the condensate solution, while the Lagrangian (13) produces the correct number of particles, $N = \int(\rho - \rho_0)\,d^2r$, and the momentum which is compatible with the Hamiltonian structure of the model:

$$\begin{aligned} P_i = &\int\left[\frac{i}{2}\left\{\psi^*(D_i\psi) - \psi(D_i\psi)^*\right\}\left(1 - \frac{\rho_0}{\rho}\right)\right. \\ &\qquad \left. -\mu\epsilon_{ij}E^jB\right]d^2x \\ = &\int\left[(\rho - \rho_0)\left(eA^i - \partial_i\mathrm{Arg}\,\psi\right) - \mu\epsilon_{ij}E^jB\right]d^2x. \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

Physically, eq. (14) implies that the condensate is electrically neutral. This may result for instance from the presence of motionless particles of the opposite charge.

The Hamiltonian formulation of this model deserves a special comment. For the nonvanishing Maxwell term ($\mu \neq 0$), it can be formulated only as a *constrained* Hamiltonian system. The Hamiltonian reads

$$H = \int \left[|\mathbf{D}\psi|^2 + U(\rho) + \frac{\mu}{2}\left(\mathbf{E}^2 + B^2\right) \right] d^2x \tag{16}$$

and the constraint is the time component of eq. (7b) (the modified Gauss law):

$$\mu \,\mathrm{div}\,\mathbf{E} - \kappa B = e(\rho - \rho_0). \tag{17}$$

The first pair of canonically conjugate variables is ψ and ψ^*, as usual. The other two canonical coordinates are A^1 and A^2, with the corresponding conjugate momenta being

$$\Pi_i = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial(\partial_0 A^i)} = \frac{\kappa}{2}\epsilon_{ij}A^j - \mu F^{i0}. \tag{18}$$

Eqs. (7) can be represented then as

$$i\psi_t = \frac{\delta \tilde{H}}{\delta \psi^*}, \quad i\psi^*_t = -\frac{\delta \tilde{H}}{\delta \psi}, \quad A^i_t = \frac{\delta \tilde{H}}{\delta \Pi_i}, \quad \Pi_{it} = -\frac{\delta \tilde{H}}{\delta A^i},$$

where $\tilde{H}$ is the Lagrange function,

$$\tilde{H} = H + \int A_0 \left\{ e(\rho - \rho_0) - \mu \,\mathrm{div}\mathbf{E} + \kappa B \right\} d^2x, \tag{19}$$

and $A_0 = A_0(\mathbf{x}, t)$ plays the rôle of the Lagrange multiplier. This formulation remains valid, of course, for the standard model ($\rho_0 = 0$.) In the pure Chern-Simons case ($\mu = 0$) the constraint (17) can be explicitly resolved which produces an alternative, unconstrained formulation [5].

The condensate solution has the form: $\psi = \sqrt{\rho_0}$, $A_0 = (1/e)F(\rho_0)$, $\mathbf{A} = 0$. This solution exists even when the potential $U(\rho)$ does not possess a symmetry breaking minimum at ρ_0. We can however confine ourselves to potentials with $U'(\rho_0) = 0$ as this condition can always be accomplished by the transformation $A_0 \to A_0 + F(\rho_0)/e$, $U(\rho) \to U(\rho) - F(\rho_0)\rho$. The condensate solution is then $\psi = \sqrt{\rho_0}$, $A_0 = 0$, $\mathbf{A} = 0$, and it corresponds to an extremum of $U(\rho)$. Through the gauge invariance, the condensate generates a set of singular solutions,

$$\psi = \sqrt{\rho_0}e^{in\theta}, \quad A_0 = 0, \quad \mathbf{A} = \frac{n}{e}\frac{\mathbf{e}_\theta}{r} \tag{20}$$

which serve as asymptotes for vortices as $r \to \infty$. The magnetic flux of the vortex is quantized: $\int B\, d^2x = \oint A_\theta \, r d\theta = (2\pi/e)n$. Integrating eq. (17) over the entire plane we observe that the flux and the charge of the vortex $Q = e\int(\rho - \rho_0)\, d^2x$ are related: $-\kappa \int B\, d^2x = Q$. Hence, Q is quantized as well:

$$Q = e\int (\rho - \rho_0)\, d^2x = -\frac{2\pi\kappa}{e}n. \tag{21}$$

Confining consideration to radially symmetric configurations, we write

$$\psi(\mathbf{x}) = \psi(r)e^{in\theta}, \tag{22a}$$

$$A_0(\mathbf{x}) = A_0(r), \tag{22b}$$

$$A^j(\mathbf{x}) = \epsilon^{jk}x_k\frac{\Phi(r)}{r^2}, \quad j, k = 1, 2. \tag{22c}$$

The magnetic field $B(r) = (1/r)\Phi_r$. Regularity at the origin requires $\psi(0) = 0$ when $n \neq 0$. For finite $\mathbf{A}(0)$ we should also have $\Phi(0) = 0$. Now making the gauge transformation $\mathrm{Arg}\,\psi \to \mathrm{Arg}\,\psi - n\,\theta$, $\Phi \to \Phi - n/e$, the system (7) is cast in the form

$$\Delta\psi - e^2\frac{\Phi^2}{r^2}\psi - eA_0\psi + F(\psi^2)\psi = 0, \tag{23a}$$

$$\mu B_r + \kappa\frac{dA_0}{dr} - 2e^2\frac{\psi^2}{r}\Phi = 0, \tag{23b}$$

$$\mu\Delta A_0 + \kappa B + e(\psi^2 - \rho_0) = 0. \tag{23c}$$

This system does not contain n explicitly. Vortices with different vorticities will be distinguished by the boundary condition at the origin: $\Phi(0) = -n/e$. Eq. (21) indicates that conventionally shaped topological vortices for which $\rho(r)$ grows monotonically from 0 to ρ_0, are of positive vorticity. Vorticity-free solutions and those with $n < 0$ have to be nodal, i.e. $\rho(r) - \rho_0$ should necessarily change sign. Relegating the comprehensive discussion of solutions to the system (23) to a more detailed publication [10], here we consider only an important special case.

Static solutions correspond to stationary points of the Hamiltonian (16) on the constraint manifold (17). In the mixed CS-Maxwell case, using the flux-vorticity relation, $\int B\, d^2x = (2\pi/e)n$ and the Bogomol'nyi decomposition,

$$|\mathbf{D}\psi|^2 = |(D_1 \pm iD_2)\psi|^2 \pm \frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{\nabla} \times \mathbf{J} \pm eB\rho, \tag{24}$$

the energy (16) takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} H = \int \Bigg\{ &|(D_1 \pm iD_2)\psi|^2 + \frac{\mu}{2}\left[B \pm \frac{e}{\mu}(\rho - \rho_0)\right]^2 \\ &- \frac{e^2}{2\mu}(\rho - \rho_0)^2 + U(\rho) + \frac{\mu}{2}(\boldsymbol{\nabla}A_0)^2 \pm \frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{\nabla} \times \mathbf{J} \Bigg\} d^2x \\ &\pm 2\pi\rho_0 n. \end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

For $U(\rho) = (e^2/2\mu)(\rho - \rho_0)^2$ (which corresponds to the Bose gas with the δ-function pairwise repulsion) and fields approaching the condensate background (20), the energy can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} H = \int \Bigg\{ &|(D_1 \pm iD_2)\psi|^2 + \frac{\mu}{2}\left[B \pm \frac{e}{\mu}(\rho - \rho_0)\right]^2 \\ &+ \frac{\mu}{2}(\boldsymbol{\nabla}A_0)^2 \Bigg\} d^2x \pm 2\pi\rho_0 n. \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

The lower bound of energy, $H = \pm 2\pi\rho_0 n$, is saturated when the following self-duality equations are satisfied:

$$(D_1 \pm iD_2)\psi = 0, \tag{27a}$$

$$B \pm \frac{e}{\mu}(\rho - \rho_0) = 0, \tag{27b}$$

$$A_0 = 0. \tag{27c}$$

The upper (lower) sign should be associated with the positive (negative) vorticity n. This can be concluded, for example, simply from the fact that the energy is positive for positive $U(\rho)$, see eq. (16). Comparing (27b) to (17), we see that solutions of eqs. (27) lie on the constraint manifold only for $\kappa = \mu$ and only in the case of the upper sign. Thus, for $\kappa > 0$, only vortices with positive vorticity may exist. Eq. (27a) yields

$$A^i = \pm\frac{1}{2e}\epsilon_{ij}\partial_j \ln\rho + \frac{1}{e}\partial_i \mathrm{Arg}\psi, \tag{28}$$

and we should retain only the upper sign here. Substituting this into (27b), we arrive at

$$\nabla^2 \ln\rho = 2\frac{e^2}{\kappa}(\rho - \rho_0). \tag{29}$$

Eq. (29) appeared previously in the self-dual limit of the relativistic Higgs model with Maxwell term [9] and is known to possess solutions with "topological vortex" asymptotic behaviour: $\rho(\infty) = \rho_0$, $\rho(0) \sim r^{2n}$, $n \geq 1$. The phase space analysis shows that it also admits lump solitons vanishing at infinity [10], but these are extraneous to the subject of the present work.

The self-duality reduction is also possible in the pure Chern-Simons case ($\mu = 0$). Making use of the identity (24) and the constraint (17), the energy (16) can be represented as

$$H = \int \left[|(D_1 \pm iD_2)\psi|^2 \mp \frac{e^2}{\kappa}(\rho - \rho_0)\rho + U(\rho) \right] d^2x.$$

Invoking eq. (21), we rewrite this as

$$H = \int \left[|(D_1 \pm iD_2)\psi|^2 \mp \frac{e^2}{\kappa}(\rho - \rho_0)^2 + U(\rho) \right] d^2x \pm 2\pi\rho_0 n. \tag{30}$$

With the choice of $U(\rho) = \pm(e^2/\kappa)(\rho - \rho_0)^2$ one observes that the energy is minimal provided $(D_1 \pm iD_2)\psi = 0$, whence we have, as before, eq. (28). Substituting this into the constraint equation (17), we arrive at

$$\nabla^2 \ln\rho = \pm 2\frac{e^2}{\kappa}(\rho - \rho_0). \tag{31}$$

Note that no equation for the scalar potential A_0 arises here. This is not surprising as A_0 is not a dynamical variable. (In our Hamiltonian formulation, it is just a Lagrange multiplier.) For any combination of the Maxwell and Chern-Simons terms A_0 can be determined from the spatial part of eq. (7b) [11]:

$$\mu\mathbf{\nabla} \times B + \kappa\mathbf{\nabla} \times A_0 = e\mathbf{J}. \tag{32}$$

The matter current is calculated from eq. (28): $\mathbf{J} = \mp\mathbf{\nabla}\times\rho$. Substituting this into eq. (32) for $\mu = 0$, we can readily solve for A_0:

$$A_0 = \mp\frac{e}{\kappa}(\rho - \rho_0). \tag{33}$$

In contrast to the mixed CS-Maxwell case, *both* signs are allowed in (31) and so the pure Chern-Simons model exhibits a wider variety of self-dual solutions [10]. Here we only dwell on the repulsive case, $U = (e^2/\kappa)(\rho - \rho_0)^2$ (positive sign in (31)). Our remark below pertains to the structure of the nonrelativistic Chern- Simons vortices. As we have already mentioned, the "vortex" solutions of eq. (29) are conventionally shaped: $\rho(r)$ is $\sim r^{2n}$ near the origin, and exponentially approaches ρ_0 as $r \to \infty$. Eq. (17) with $\mu = 0$ implies that the magnetic field is greatest at the centre of the vortex, and rapidly decays to zero as $r \to \infty$. (This is in contrast to the relativistic case [2,3] where the magnetic field is concentrated in a ring.) Eq. (33) meanwhile indicates that the electric field, $\mathbf{E} = -\mathbf{e_r} dA_0/dr$, is localized within a ring around the centre of the vortex and vanishes both at $r = 0$ and $r \to \infty$. The structure of the mixed CS-Maxwell self-dual vortex is the same, with the exception that it carries no electric field.

We thank Professors P. G. L. Leach and P. Wiegmann for their useful remarks about this work. This research was supported by the Foundation for Research Development of South Africa and the Visiting Lecturer's Fund of UCT.

---

[1] For a review and reference see e.g. R. Jackiw and S.-Y. Pi, Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl. **107**, 1 (1992).

[2] J. Hong, Y. Kim, and P. Y. Pac, Phys. Rev. Lett. **64**, 2230 (1990).

[3] R. Jackiw and E. J. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **64**, 2234 (1990).

[4] R. Jackiw, K. Lee, and E. J. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. D **42**, 3488 (1990).

[5] R. Jackiw and S.-Y. Pi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **64**, 2969 (1990); Phys. Rev. D **42**, 3500 (1990).

[6] I. V. Barashenkov and A. O. Harin, Inst. Theor. Phys. Astrophys., UCT, Cape Town, Preprint 1993/4, 1993

[7] I. V. Barashenkov and E. Yu. Panova, Physica D **69**, 114 (1993).

[8] M. M. Bogdan, A. S. Kovalev, and A. M. Kosevich, Fiz. Nizk. Temp. **15**, 511 (1989).

[9] E. B. Bogomol'nyi, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **24**, 449 (1976).

[10] I. V. Barashenkov and A. O. Harin, (in preparation).

[11] In the pure Chern-Simons case eq. (17) can be solved for **A** and so the vector potential can also be treated as a dependent variable. This is the formulation utilized by Jackiw and Pi [5], whereas we treat **A** as a dynamical variable. The resulting equations are, of course, equivalent.